

Thermodynamics of high dimensional Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes: variable cosmological constant

S. Wang*

*College of Physical Science and Technology, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, Hubei, 430079, China
and Astrophysics Center, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, China*

We study the thermodynamic properties of high dimensional Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes with the consideration of quantum effects. It is shown that by considering the cosmological constant as a variable state parameter and adding an extra term which denotes the vacuum energy, both the differential and integral mass formulas of the first law of Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes can be directly derived from the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics in a simple and natural way. Furthermore, after taking quantum effects into account, we can see that the cosmological constant must decrease and the spontaneous decay of the vacuum energy never makes the entropy of Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes decrease. In addition, though the laws of thermodynamics are very powerful, at least the third law can not be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. It should be emphasized that these conclusions come into existence in any dimension.

PACS numbers: 04.70.Dy, 97.60.Lf

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the seminal work of Bekenstein [1] and Hawking [2], black hole thermodynamics [3] had been well established over the past three decades via a close analogy to the four laws of the usual thermodynamics system [4]. In particular, it has been generally proved [5] that for asymptotic flat black holes in any dimensions, the differential expression of the first law and the corresponding integral mass formula take the form

$$dM = TdS + \Omega dJ, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{D-3}{D-2}M = TS + \Omega J, \quad (2)$$

where D is the spacetime dimensions, M , T , S , Ω and J are Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) mass, temperature, Benkenstein-Hawking entropy, angular velocity, and angular momentum of the black hole, respectively.

Recently, considerable attention has been concentrated on the study of de Sitter spacetimes and asymptotically de Sitter spacetimes. This is motivated, basically, by the following two aspects: First, the Type Ia supernova observations indicate that our universe is in a phase of accelerating expansion [6]. That is to say, there is a positive cosmological constant in our universe and our universe might approach to a de Sitter phase in the far future. Second, defined in a manner analogous to the AdS/CFT correspondence, an interesting proposal, the so-called dS/CFT correspondence, has been suggested that there is a dual relation between quantum gravity on a de Sitter (dS) space and Euclidean conformal field theory (CFT) on a boundary of de Sitter space [7, 8, 9, 10].

With the advent of AdS/CFT and dS/CFT correspondence, studies of thermodynamics properties of black holes, especially in the background geometry with a fixed cosmological constant, have attracted considerable attention in recent years [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. For instance, It has been recently shown by Gibbon *et al.* [16] that with a suitable definition of the conserved charges such as mass and angular momentum, the differential mass formula (1) keeps to be true for rotating black holes with an invariable cosmological constant background in four, five and higher dimensions. However, under the assumption of a fixed cosmological constant, it is clear that the integral expression (2) can never be satisfied any more.

In order to rectify this situation, in a previous paper [17], we have investigated the thermodynamics of the (2+1)-dimensional BTZ black holes and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes, and shown that it is possible for us to consider the cosmological constant $\Lambda = (D-1)(D-2)/2l^2$ as a varying parameter and promoting it to a thermodynamics state variable. With this assumption, both the differential and integral mass formulas of Kerr de Sitter spacetimes can be satisfied.

As well known, the cosmological constant was originally introduced by Einstein to keep our universe as a static universe. Though the discovery by Hubble that the universe is expanding eliminated the empirical need for a static world model, the disappearance of the original motivation for introducing the cosmological constant did not change its status as a legitimate addition to the gravitational field equations, or as a parameter to be constrained by observation [18, 19, 20]. There are two cosmological constant problems. the old one is to understand why there is a huge gap between the theoretical and observational values of the cosmological constant. The new one, which had not been realized until Type Ia supernova observations provided the evidence that our universe is accelerating, is to understand why the energy density of vacuum has the same order of magnitude with

*Electronic address: wjysysgj@163.com

the present mass density of the universe [21, 22]. In order to solve these two intriguing problems, considerable works had been done [22, 23, 24, 25]. We do not further discuss these problems here, but only focus on a question: it is reasonable whether or not for us to treat the cosmological constant as a variable parameter?

Twenty years ago, Henneaux and Teitelboim have already shown that the cosmological constant could be treated as a variable parameter [26] (For more details, see Ref. [27]). Before long, It was also conjectured by Weinberg that the role of the cosmological constant is played by a slowly varying potential of a scalar field [28]. the original motivation for considering cosmological constant as a variable parameter is the factual need of solving those two cosmological constant problems that mentioned above [21, 22]. To my present knowledge, there are at least three particle physics models, with a discrete spectrum of vacuum energy density ρ_Λ , would allow cosmological constant Λ to take different values. The first discrete- ρ_Λ model, introduced by Abbott [29], considers a self-interacting scalar field ϕ with a washboard potential $V(\phi)$. In this model, the vacuum at $\phi = \phi_n$ has energy density $\rho_{\Lambda n} = n\epsilon + \text{const}$, and can decay through bubble nucleation to the vacuum at ϕ_{n-1} . The upward quantum jumps from ϕ_{n-1} to ϕ_n are also possible [30]. The second discrete- ρ_Λ model, first discussed by Brown and Teitelboim [31], assumes that the cosmological constant is due to a four-form field $F^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \frac{F}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, which can change its value through the nucleation of branes. The total vacuum energy density is given by $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{\text{bare}} + \frac{1}{2}F^2$, where $\rho_{\text{bare}} < 0$ is the ‘bare’ cosmological constant at $F = 0$; The change of the field $\Delta F = \pm q$, where $q = \text{const}$ is fixed by the model (For related work, see Ref. [32]). The third discrete- ρ_Λ model, developed by Bousso and Polchinski [33], is a different version of the four-form model. In this model, several four-forms fields F_i are present, so the total vacuum energy density takes the form $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{\text{bare}} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i F_i^2$. It is clear that these four-form fields can also change their value through the nucleation of branes (It should be pointed out that this model is quite different from the second model. For more detail, see Refs. [33, 34]). As Dvali and Vilenkin argued, the varying of four-form field can also be attributed to a spontaneously broken discrete symmetry [35]. Since the vacuum energy density is a variable parameter, as a measure of vacuum energy density [20, 22], the cosmological constant should not be viewed as a fixed parameter, also. This assumption of variable cosmological constant is also supported by some other works [36, 37, 38, 39, 40].

Recently, with the assumption of variable cosmological constant, the first and second law of four-dimensional Kerr-Newman black hole in de Sitter backgrounds had already been well studied [40]. However, to my present knowledge, the thermodynamic properties of higher dimensional case in the background geometry with a variable cosmological constant have not been investigated. In the present paper, we will expand the investigation to the higher dimensional case. This subject is mainly

motivated by the fact that recent brane-world scenarios [41] predict the emergence of a TeV-scale gravity in the higher-dimensional theories, thus open the possibility to explore extra dimensions by making tiny black holes in the high-energy collides [42] (LHC) that to be running soon. Within this context, it is not unnecessary to take higher dimensional case into account. We will show that the differential and integral mass formulas of first law take the forms

$$dM = TdS + \Theta dl, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{D-3}{D-2}M = TS + \frac{1}{D-2}\Theta l, \quad (4)$$

Where Θ is a generalized force conjugate to the cosmological radius l ; the combination Θl has the dimension of energy and denotes the vacuum energy. It will be proved that both the mass formulas (3) and (4) can be directly derived from the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics, and come into existence in any dimension.

Recently, It has been pointed that when one consider the second law of black hole thermodynamics, the quantum effects must be taken into account [40]. It is found that after taking quantum effects into account, the cosmological constant must decrease and the spontaneous decay of the vacuum energy never makes the entropy of the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes decrease.

The authors of Ref. [43] argue that all the four laws of thermodynamics can be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. However, it seems that though the laws of thermodynamics are very powerful, at least the third law can not be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In Sec II, we study the first law of black hole thermodynamics in Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. With the assumption of variable cosmological constant, we can see that both the mass formulas (3) and (4) can be directly derived from the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics, and come into existence in any dimension. In Sec III, we discuss the second law of Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. It is found that after taking quantum effects into account, the cosmological constant must decrease and the spontaneous decay of the vacuum energy never makes the entropy of the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes decrease. In Sec IV, we study other laws of thermodynamics and find that the third law can not be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. Sec V contains a brief remark.

Throughout this paper, the metric signature adopted is $(-, +, +, +)$, and the natural units $c = \hbar = G = \kappa = 1$ are used.

II. THE FIRST LAW

It has been proved that in Boyer-Linquist coordinates, the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics for arbitrary

dimension takes the form [16]

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 = & -\left(1 - \frac{r^2}{l^2}\right)d\tau^2 + \frac{2m}{U}d\tau^2 + \frac{Udr^2}{V-2m} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N r^2(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2 d\varphi_i^2) \\
& + \frac{l^{-2}}{1-r^2l^{-2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N r^2\mu_i d\mu_i\right)^2, \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

Where

$$U = r^{D-3}, \quad V = r^{D-3}\left(1 - \frac{r^2}{l^2}\right). \quad (6)$$

This metric depends on two parameters: the mass m , and the cosmological radius l , which is related to the cosmological constant Λ by $\Lambda = (D-1)(D-2)/2l^2$.

The horizons are located at

$$r^{D-3}\left(1 - \frac{r^2}{l^2}\right) - 2m = 0. \quad (7)$$

This algebra equation has several positive solutions, which associated with multiple horizons. The largest one denotes the cosmological horizon radius r_c , and the smallest one corresponds to the black hole horizon radius r_h . The relation between the physical mass and the geometrical parameter can be written as [16]

$$M_h = -M_c = f(D)m, \quad (8)$$

where M_c and M_h are mass of cosmological horizon and black hole horizon respectively, $f(D)$ is a function of the spacetime dimensions D . It can be seen as follows, the expressions of the differential and integral mass formulas of the first law have nothing to do with the form of $f(D)$.

It is well known that the Hawking temperatures associated with the cosmological horizon and black hole horizon, respectively, are not equal [44]. They both emit Hawking radiation at the corresponding temperatures and are not in thermal equilibrium. As Teitelboim pointed out [45], we must take into account two different idealized physical systems. One is a black hole horizon enclosed in a cosmological boundary, the other is a cosmological horizon enclosed in a black hole boundary. When we discuss the thermodynamics properties of either one of them, the other one must be viewed as a boundary. (Owing to the existence of multiple horizons, the thermodynamic aspects of Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes have not been well explored so far. Recently, it has been argued that in general for a spherically symmetric spacetime with multiple horizons, the temperature of radiation is proportional to the effective surface gravity, and the equilibrium temperature in Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes is the harmonic mean of cosmological and black hole horizon temperatures. For more detail, see Ref. [14])

Let us discuss the cosmological horizon first. As mentioned above, the black hole horizon must be treated as a boundary. The area of the cosmological horizon is

$$A_c = \frac{(D-1)\pi^{(D-1)/2}}{\Gamma[(D+1)/2]} r_c^{D-2}, \quad (9)$$

Note that the macroscopic entropy-area law which relates thermodynamic entropy to the area of event horizon is universally valid for any types of black holes belonging to Schwarzschild family, thus

$$S_c = \frac{A_c}{4} = \frac{(D-1)\pi^{(D-1)/2}}{4\Gamma[(D+1)/2]} r_c^{D-2} = \frac{r_c^{D-2}}{g(D)}, \quad (10)$$

Where $g(D)$ is a function of the spacetime dimensions D . Making use of eps. (7), (8) and (10), one can obtain

$$M_c = -\frac{f(D)}{2}[g(D)S_c]^{\frac{D-3}{D-2}} + \frac{f(D)}{2l^2}[g(D)S_c]^{\frac{D-1}{D-2}}, \quad (11)$$

This is the so-called generalized Smarr formula [46], and it contains all the information about the thermodynamics state of cosmological horizon.

Just like our universe should be treated as an open system [47], de Sitter spacetimes should not be regarded as an isolated system [43]. This is because when the cosmological constant changes, the horizon shrinks or expands and thus sweeps some region with a nonzero cosmological constant, leading to the variation of the four-volume of the Euclidean de Sitter spacetimes.

As mentioned above, the cosmological constant should be treated as a variable state parameter. It must be emphasized that this assumption can never be justified in classical theory (i.e. general relativity) [40]. If we want to explain it on physical grounds, we must take quantum effects into account. In fact, particle physics has already provided us several approaches to explain why should cosmological constant Λ be a variable. For instance, it can be well explained by the four-form model [31, 32]. This model has recently attracted much attention because four-form fields with appropriate couplings to branes naturally arise in the context of M-theory [22].

The author of Ref. [40] argues that one should choose Λ as a thermodynamics state variable for a clearer physical meaning. However, it is not absolutely necessary for one to do so. For instance, one can choose l^n (where $n \leq D$) as a thermodynamics state variable. When $n = 1$, l has dimension of length and Θ can be treated as generalized force; when $n = 2$, l^2 has dimension of area and Θ can be treated as generalized surface gravity; when $n = 3$, l^3 has dimension of volume and Θ can be treated as generalized pressure; when $n = -2$, l^{-2} has the same dimension with cosmological constant and Θ can be interpreted as generalized volume (see Ref.[40]). If only the combination Θl^n has the dimension of energy and denotes the vacuum energy (It must be emphasized that this vacuum energy term can be provided by quantum effects. For related work, see Refs. [48, 49, 50]),

there is no essential difference among the different choices of state variable. For simplicity, here we still choose l as thermodynamics state variable.

The Hawking temperature and the generalized force can be computed

$$T_c = -\frac{f(D)g(D)[(D-3)l^2 - (D-1)r_c^2]}{2(D-2)r_cl^2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\Theta_c = -\frac{f(D)}{l^3}[g(D)S_c]^{\frac{D-1}{D-2}} = -\frac{f(D)r_c^{D-1}}{l^3}, \quad (13)$$

Then one can obtain

$$dM_c = T_c dS_c + \Theta_c dl, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{D-3}{D-2}M_c = T_c S_c + \frac{1}{D-2}\Theta_c l, \quad (15)$$

We can see that both the differential and integral expression can satisfy the formulas (3) and (4). It is clear that if we do not consider the cosmological constant as a variable state parameter, the integral mass formulas (15) can never be obtained.

Next, we will discuss the black hole horizon. Then the cosmological horizon must be treated as a boundary. Obviously, there exists a situation analogous to that of electric charge on a two-sphere [45]. In that case, if a charge q is placed at the North Pole, an opposite charge, $-q$, must appear at the South Pole. The same phenomenon occurs here for the energy in $r-t$ space. The area of the black hole horizon is

$$A_h = \frac{(D-1)\pi^{(D-1)/2}}{\Gamma[(D+1)/2]}r_h^{D-2}, \quad (16)$$

According to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy-area law

$$S_h = \frac{A_h}{4} = \frac{(D-1)\pi^{(D-1)/2}}{4\Gamma[(D+1)/2]}r_h^{D-2} = \frac{r_h^{D-2}}{g(D)}, \quad (17)$$

Making use of eps. (7), (8) and (17), one can obtain

$$M_h = \frac{f(D)}{2}[g(D)S_h]^{\frac{D-3}{D-2}} - \frac{f(D)}{2l^2}[g(D)S_h]^{\frac{D-1}{D-2}}, \quad (18)$$

In fact, there exist other methods to calculate the conserved quantities in de Sitter spacetimes. For example, in Ref. [51], the authors use the Balasubramanian-Boer-Minic (BBM) prescription [52] to calculate the conserved quantities for cosmological horizon and the Abbott-Deser (AD) prescription [53] to calculate the ones for black hole horizon, respectively. However, if one uses these methods, the generalized Smarr formula [(11) and (18)] can not be obtained, and then the integral mass formulas (4) can never be derived.

The Hawking temperature and the generalized force can be computed

$$T_h = \frac{f(D)g(D)[(D-3)l^2 - (D-1)r_h^2]}{2(D-2)r_h l^2}, \quad (19)$$

$$\Theta_h = \frac{f(D)}{l^3}[g(D)S_h]^{\frac{D-1}{D-2}} = \frac{f(D)r_h^{D-1}}{l^3}, \quad (20)$$

Then one can obtain

$$dM_h = T_h dS_h + \Theta_h dl, \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{D-3}{D-2}M_h = T_h S_h + \frac{1}{D-2}\Theta_h l, \quad (22)$$

We have succeeded in deriving the differential and integral mass formulas of the first law from the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics in a simple and natural way. It is clear that these two formulas come into existence in any dimension. As Carlip and Vaidya pointed out [54], one should take into account not just the black hole, but its surroundings as well. It is interesting to further extend the present investigation to the full thermal environment of a black hole.

III. THE SECOND LAW

Let us turn our attention to the second law of thermodynamics. As mentioned above, the quantum effects (i.e. quantum evaporate and quantum anti-evaporate process. For more detail, see Refs. [48, 49]) must be taken into account.

For black hole horizon,

$$-T_h dS_h = \frac{f(D)r_h^{D-1}}{l^3}dl, \quad (23)$$

The left side denotes the entropy loss of black hole horizon, and the right side denotes the decrease of vacuum energy inside the black hole horizon. We can see that the decrease of vacuum energy is equal to the entropy decreasing of black hole horizon. For observer outside the black hole horizon, the total energy variation is seen as the decrease of entropy inside the black hole horizon. This energy is carried away from inside to outside by means of Hawking radiation.

For cosmological horizon,

$$T_c dS_c = \frac{f(D)r_c^{D-1}}{l^3}dl, \quad (24)$$

The left side expresses the entropy increase of cosmological horizon, and the right side expresses the increase of vacuum energy in the visible region $r_h < r < r_c$. Vacuum energy is transformed quantum mechanically to the energy of radiation from outside to inside. That is to say, the origin of Hawking radiation can be attributed to the varying of cosmological constant [40]. Noting that $\Lambda \propto l^{-2}$, it is easy for us to see that the generalized entropy S_c increases if and only if the cosmological constant Λ decreases. In other words, the cosmological constant must decrease through quantum effects owing to the generalized second law requires that generalized entropy never decreases for all physical processes.

Base on eqs. (23) and (24), one can obtain

$$T_c dS_c = -T_h dS_h + \frac{r_c^{D-1} - r_h^{D-1}}{l^3} f(D) dl, \quad (25)$$

This equation implies that the entropy increase of cosmological horizon is due to the thermal radiation from the cosmological and black hole horizon. That is to say, the origins of entropy increase are the increase of vacuum energy in the visible region $r_h < r < r_c$ (because r_c increases and r_h shrinks when cosmological constant Λ decreases, the total vacuum energy in the region $r_h < r < r_c$ must increase) and Hawking radiation from these two horizons. Since the generalized second law requires that generalized entropy never decreases for all physical processes, the cosmological constant must decrease. In other words, the spontaneous decay of the vacuum energy never makes the entropy of the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes decrease.

An example of the spontaneous decay of the vacuum energy is the quantum tunneling from the false vacuum of Higgs potential [43]. The final potential in the quantum tunneling is never higher than the initial potential, which corresponds to monotonically decrease of the cosmological constant. (Indeed, since Parikh and Wilczek [55] presented a greatly simplified model to implement the Hawking radiation as a semi-classical tunnelling process, considerable attention has been focused on extending this semi-classical tunnelling method to various cases of black holes. For more detail, see Refs. [56, 57, 58])

IV. THE ZEROETH AND THIRD LAWS

The authors of Ref. [43] argue that all the four laws of thermodynamics can be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes (universes). Except for the first law and the second law we have discussed above, other laws can be written as:

The zeroth law: the cosmological constant should be same at all places.

The third law: the cosmological constant can never reach to zero by finite physical processes.

It is obvious that the zeroth law is undoubtedly correct. Since the cosmological constant is independent of spacetime coordinates, if it decreases inside the cosmological horizon, it must decrease at the outside also. That is to say, the vacuum energy density should decrease at same velocity everywhere. Therefore, though cosmological constant must decay, we can still say that it should be same at all places. However, the third law seems not so reasonable.

As well known, the third law of ordinary thermodynamics system demands $\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow 0} S = 0$. We have already obtained

$$S = \frac{(D-1)\pi^{(D-1)/2}}{4\Gamma[(D+1)/2]} r^{D-2}, \quad (26)$$

It is clear that the cosmological constant Λ (or the cosmological radius l) has nothing to do with entropy S , i.e.

$\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow 0} S \neq 0$. In addition, base on the above discussions

$$T = \frac{f(D)g(D)[(D-3)l^2 - (D-1)r^2]}{2(D-2)rl^2}, \quad (27)$$

We can see that in the limit $l \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e. $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$), it is clear that $T \neq 0$. So there is no inherent relation between temperature T and cosmological constant Λ . Base on these discussions, we can say that there is no enough evidence to support the third law of de Sitter spacetimes from the view of mathematics.

Let us turn to the view of physics. Though there is a nonzero positive cosmological constant in our present universe, It is extremely small and will decay all the times. So far, there is no principle that could stop this process of decaying being discovered. Therefore, the third law of thermodynamics cannot be directly applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In summary, we have investigated the thermodynamic properties of high dimensional Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. By treating cosmological constant as a variable state parameter and adding an extra term that denotes the vacuum energy, we can prove that both the differential and integral mass formulas [(3) and (4)] of the first law of Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes can be directly derived from the general Schwarzschild de Sitter metrics. Furthermore, it is shown that the cosmological constant must decrease and the spontaneous decay of the vacuum never makes the entropy of the Schwarzschild de Sitter universe decrease. In addition, it is found that though the laws of thermodynamics are very powerful, at least the third law can not be applied to the Schwarzschild de Sitter spacetimes. It is obvious that these conclusions come into existence in any dimension.

Since the Type Ia supernova observations indicate that our universe is in a phase of accelerating expansion, recently there is much attention [59, 60] have being paid to investigate the thermodynamic properties of the universe with a positive cosmological constant. It should be pointed that these works are base on the background geometry with a fixed cosmological constant. It is interesting to investigate the Thermodynamics properties of an accelerated expanding universe with the framework of variable cosmological constant. This issue deserves further research in the future.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Prof. S.Q. Wu for useful and valuable discussions. I also thank S. Odintsov, T. Padmanabhan and S. Shankaranarayanan for helpful suggestions.

-
- [1] J. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973); Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3292 (1974).
 - [2] S.W. Hawking, Nature. **248**, 30 (1974); Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).
 - [3] J. Bekenstein, Physics Today. **33**, 24 (1980).
 - [4] J.M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S.W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **31**, 161 (1973).
 - [5] J.P. Gauntlett, R. Myers and P. Townsend, Class. Quant. Grav. **16**, 1 (1999).
 - [6] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **483**, 565 (1997); R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1582 (1998).
 - [7] E. Witten, arXiv:hep-th/0106109.
 - [8] A. Strominger, JHEP **0110**, 034 (2001); JHEP **0111**, 049 (2001).
 - [9] C.M. Hull, JHEP **9807**, 021 (1998); C.M. Hull, and R.R. Khuri, Nucl. Phys. B **575**, 231 (2000).
 - [10] P.O. Mazur and E. Mottola, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 104022 (2001).
 - [11] M. Banados, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1849 (1992); M. Banados, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 1506 (1993).
 - [12] M.H. Dehghani, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 104003 (2002); Phys. Rev. D **65**, 104030 (2002).
 - [13] S.Q. Wu, Phys. Lett. B **608**, 251 (2005).
 - [14] S. Shankaranarayanan, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 084026 (2003).
 - [15] R.G. Cai, Phys. Lett. B **525**, 331 (2002); R.G. Cai, L.M. Cao and D.W. Pang, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 044009 (2005).
 - [16] G.W. Gibbons, H. Lu, D.N. Page and C.N. Pope, J. Geom. Phys. **53**, 49 (2005); G. W. Gibbons, M. J. Perry and C. N. Pope, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 1503 (2005).
 - [17] S. Wang, S.Q. Wu, F. Xie and L. Dan, Chin. Phys. Lett. **23**, 1096 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0601147].
 - [18] L.M. Krauss, and M.S. Turner, Gen. Rel. Grav. **27**, 1137 (1995).
 - [19] J.D. Cohn, arXiv:astro-ph/9807128; V. Sahni and A. Starobinsky, arXiv:astro-ph/9904398
 - [20] S.M. Carroll, Living. Rev. Rel. **4**, 1 (2001).
 - [21] S. Weinberg, arXiv:astro-ph/0005265 Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).
 - [22] J. Garriga, and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 023517 (2001).
 - [23] T. Padmanabhan, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 107 (2005); Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 167 (2002).
 - [24] N. Arkani-Hamed, L.J. Hall, C. Kolda, and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4434 (2000).
 - [25] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4438 (2000); Phys. Rev. D **63**, 103510 (2001).
 - [26] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Commun. Math. Phys. **98**, 391 (1985).
 - [27] A. Gomberoff, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 083520 (2004).
 - [28] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2607 (1987).
 - [29] L. Abbot, Phys. Lett. B **195**, 177 (1987).
 - [30] K. Lee and E.J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1088 (1987).
 - [31] J. Brown and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. B **195**, 177 (1987); Nucl. Phys. B **297**, 787 (1988).
 - [32] J.L. Feng, J.M. Russell, S. Sethi, and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B **602**, 307 (2001).
 - [33] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **0006**, 006 (2000).
 - [34] T. Banks, M. Dine and L. Motl, JHEP **0101**, 031 (2001).
 - [35] G. Dvali and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 063509 (2001).
 - [36] J.D.E. Creighton and R.B. Mann, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4569 (1995).
 - [37] M. Caldarelli, G. Cognola and D. Klemm, Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 399 (2000).
 - [38] I.L. Shapiro, J. Sola, C.E. Bonet, and P.R. Lapuente, Phys. Lett. B **574**, 149 (2003).
 - [39] R. Horvat, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 087301 (2004).
 - [40] Y. Sekiwa, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 084009 (2006).
 - [41] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999); Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4690 (1999).
 - [42] S. Dimopoulos, and G. Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 161602 (2001); D.M. Eardley, and S.B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 044011 (2002).
 - [43] C.G. Huang, L. Liu and B. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 083501 (2002).
 - [44] G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2738 (1977).
 - [45] C. Teitelboim, arXiv: hep-th/0203258; A. Gomberoff and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 104024 (2003).
 - [46] L. Smarr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 71 (1973).
 - [47] I. Prigogine, J. Geheniau, E. Gunzig, and P. Nardone, Gen. Rel. Grav. **21**, 767 (1989).
 - [48] R. Bousso and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2436 (1998); Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6312 (1996).
 - [49] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 044026 (1999); arXiv:hep-th/9905089
 - [50] T. Padmanabhan, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 5387 (2002).
 - [51] R.G. Cai, Nucl. Phys. B **628**, 375 (2002).
 - [52] V. Balasubramanian, J. de Boer and D. Minic, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 123508 (2002)
 - [53] L.F. Abbott and S. Deser, Nucl. Phys. B **195**, 76 (1982).
 - [54] S. Carlip and S. Vaidya, Nature. **421**, 498 (2003).
 - [55] M.K. Parikh, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5042 (2000).
 - [56] E.C. Vagenas, Phys. Lett. B **503**, 399 (2001); Phys. Lett. B **533**, 302 (2002).
 - [57] S. Hemming, and E. Keski-Vakkuri, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 044006 (2001); A.J.M. Medved, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 124009 (2002).
 - [58] S.Q. Wu, and Q.Q. Jiang, JHEP **03**, 079 (2006); Q.Q. Jiang, and S.Q. Wu, Phys. Lett. B **635**, 151 (2006); Q.Q. Jiang, S.Q. Wu, and X. Cai, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 064003 (2006).
 - [59] R.G. Cai and S.P. Kim, JHEP **0502**, 050 (2005).
 - [60] B. Wang, Y.G. Gong and E. Abdalla, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 083520 (2006); Y.G. Gong, B. Wang and A.Z. Wang JCAP **0701**, 024 (2007).